



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,925	03/30/2004	Atsufumi Shibayama	040405-0368	3161

22428 7590 06/25/2008
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

INGBERG, TODD D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2193

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/811,925	SHIBAYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Todd Ingberg	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/04, 11/04, 3/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1 – 22 have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) filed March 30, 2004, November 20, 2004 and October 13, 2006 have been considered.

Drawings

2. The drawings filed March 20, 2004 have been accepted.

Priority

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. For non method claims the invention must be clearly and concisely claimed on a tangibly embodied medium (hardware – no signals). Method claims must conform with in re Bilsky.

The claims are presented in their current format(prior to 101 amendment). Examiner has not identified prior art of record that makes the invention obvious or anticipated.

Claim 1

A program parallelization device comprising: a control/data flow analysis unit which analyzes

Art Unit: 2193

the control flow and the data flow of a sequential processing program; a fork point candidate determination unit which determines the fork point candidates of the sequential processing program by referring to the results of the analysis of the control flow and the data flow by said control/data flow analysis unit; a parallel execution performance evaluation unit which evaluates, with respect to an input data, a parallel execution performance when the sequential processing program has been parallelized by a test combination of fork point candidates that were given ; a best fork point candidate combination determination unit which generates a test combination of the fork point candidates that were determined by said fork point candidate determination unit, provides the test combination to said parallel execution performance evaluation unit, and by taking the parallel execution performance of the test fork point candidate combination evaluated thereby as the reference, determines the best fork point candidate combination; and a parallelized program output unit which generates and outputs a parallelized program by inserting a fork command at each fork point candidate of the best combination determined by said best fork point candidate combination determination unit.

Claim 3

The program parallelization device as set forth in claim 1, wherein said parallel execution performance evaluation unit generates a sequential execution trace when the sequential processing program was sequentially executed with the input data, divides the sequential execution trace by taking all the terminal point candidates as division points, analyzes thread element information for each thread element, and simulates parallel execution by units of thread element with respect to the test combination of the fork point candidates that were given to calculate the parallel execution performance.

Claim 4

The program parallelization device as set forth in claim 1, wherein said best fork point candidate combination determination unit constructs a better combination by ranking the fork point candidates determined by said fork candidate determination unit in the order in which the fork point candidates are predicted to have an influence on parallel execution performance, and evaluating the parallel execution performance according to this order by taking the best fork point candidate combination at that time as the reference.

Claim 5

The program parallelization device as set forth in claim 4, wherein said best fork point candidate combination determination unit assuming that the combination of the fork point candidates including the prescribed numbers from the top in the order of the fork point candidates determined is an initial combination, evaluates the parallel execution performance of the initial combination with said parallel execution performance evaluation unit, and sets the initial combination to the best fork point candidate combination at this time.

Claim 6

The program parallelization device as set forth in claim 1, wherein said best fork point candidate

Art Unit: 2193

combination determination unit divides said collection of all the fork point candidates that have been determined by said fork point candidate determination unit into fork point candidate groups in such a way that the fork point candidates have as little effects as possible on each other, generates a test fork point candidate combination for a group in the divided fork point candidate groups in which the best fork point candidate combination determination processing has not been performed, performs the best fork point candidate combination determination processing that determines the best fork point candidate combination by referring to the result of parallel execution performance of the test fork point candidate combination evaluated by said parallel execution performance evaluation unit, and determines the sum of the best fork point candidate combinations, which are the processing results for each group, as the overall processing result.

Claim 7

The program parallelization device as set forth in claim 6, wherein said best fork point candidate combination determination unit calls the fork point candidate group partition processing taking the collection of all the fork point candidates determined by said fork point candidate determination unit as a collection after the processing of said fork point candidate determination unit has been completed, when the fork point candidate group partition processing is called, starts the group partition processing of the collection if the number of fork point candidates belonging to the given fork point candidate collection is higher than the designated division number lower limit, returns to the origin from where the fork point candidate group partition processing was called without performing the group partition processing if the number of the fork point candidates is lower, divides from the collection the fork point candidate collections in which the number of fork point candidates that cancel themselves is higher than the designated number to generate a new group, further divides the collection into two groups, recursively calls the fork point candidate group partition processing taking one group as a collection and performs group partitioning of the group, recursively calls the fork point candidate group partitioning process taking the other group as a collection and performs group partitioning of the group, returns to the origin from where the fork point candidate group partitioning process was called, performs the best fork point candidate combination determination processing for the groups in which the best fork point candidate combination determination processing has not been performed among the groups of fork point candidates that were divided, determines whether the processing of all the groups has been completed, if there is a group that has not been processed, reiterates the best fork point candidate combination determination processing for the groups that have not been processed, and, when the processing of all the groups has been completed, outputs the sum of the fork point candidate combination, which is the result of processing for each group, as the overall result.

Claim 2

A program parallelization device comprising: a control/data flow analysis unit which analyzes the control flow and the data flow of a sequential processing program; a fork point candidate determination unit which determines the fork point candidates of the sequential processing program by referring to the results of the analysis of the control flow and the data flow by said

Art Unit: 2193

control/data flow analysis unit; a parallel execution performance evaluation unit which evaluates, with respect to an input data, a parallel execution performance when the sequential processing program has been parallelized by a test combination of fork point candidates that were given; a best fork point candidate combination determination unit which generates a test combination only consisting of the combination of fork point candidates that can be simultaneously executed in the one-time fork model from the fork point candidates determined by said fork point candidate determination unit, provides the test combination to said parallel execution performance evaluation unit, and by taking the parallel execution performance of the test fork point candidate combination evaluated thereby as the reference, determines the best fork point candidate combination; a parallelized program output unit which generates and outputs a parallelized program by inserting a fork command at each fork point candidate of the best combination determined by said best fork point candidate combination determination unit.

Claim 8

A program parallelization method for a multithreading method in which a sequential processing program is divided into a plurality of threads and a plurality of processors execute the threads in parallel, comprising the steps of: analyzing the control flow and the data flow of a sequential processing program; determining the fork point candidates of the sequential processing program by referring to the results of the analysis of the control flow and the data flow; generating a test fork point candidate combination from the determined fork point candidates; evaluating, with respect to an input data, the parallel execution performance when the sequential processing program has been parallelized by the generated test fork point candidate combination; determining a best fork point candidate combination by taking the parallel execution performance of the evaluated test fork point candidate combination as the reference; inserting a fork command at each fork point candidate in the determined best combination to generate and output a parallelized program.

Claim 12

The program parallelization method as set forth in claim 8, wherein the step of evaluating said parallel execution performance generates a sequential execution trace when the sequential processing program was sequentially executed with the input data, divides the sequential execution trace by taking all the terminal point candidates as division points, analyzes thread element information for each thread element, and simulates parallel execution by units of thread element with respect to the test combination of the fork point candidates that were given to calculate the parallel execution performance.

Claim 13

The program parallelization method as set forth in claim 8, wherein the step of determining the best combination of said fork point candidates constructs a better combination by ranking the fork point candidates determined by said fork candidate determination unit in the order in which the fork point candidates are predicted to have an influence on parallel execution performance,

Art Unit: 2193

and evaluating the parallel execution performance according to the order by taking the best fork point candidate combination at that time as the reference.

Claim 14

The program parallelization method as set forth in claim 8, wherein the step of determining the best combination of said fork point candidates divides the collection of all the fork point candidates into fork point candidate groups in such a way that the fork point candidates have as little effects as possible on each other, generates a test fork point candidate combination for a group in the divided fork point candidate groups in which the best fork point candidate combination determination processing has not been performed, performs the best fork point candidate combination determination processing that determines the best fork point candidate combination by referring to the result of parallel execution performance of the test fork point candidate combination evaluated with respect to an input data, and determines the sum of the best fork point candidate combinations, which are the processing results for each group, as the overall processing result.

Claim 15

The program parallelization method as set forth in claim 8, wherein the step of determining the best combination of said fork point candidates calls the fork point candidate group partition processing taking the collection of all the fork point candidates determined by the fork point candidate determination unit as a collection after the processing of said fork point candidate determination unit has been completed, when the fork point candidate group partition processing is called, starts the group partition processing of the collection if the number of fork point candidates belonging to the given fork point candidate collection is higher than the designated division number lower limit, returns to the origin from where the fork point candidate group partition processing was called without performing the group partition processing if the number of the fork point candidates is lower, divides from the collection the fork point candidate collections in which the number of fork point candidates that cancel themselves is higher than the designated number to generate a new group, further divides the collection into two groups, recursively calls the fork point candidate group partition processing taking one group as a collection and performs group partitioning of the group, recursively calls the fork point candidate group partitioning process taking the other group as a collection and performs group partitioning of the group, returns to the origin from where the fork point candidate group partitioning process was called, performs the best fork point candidate combination determination processing for the groups in which the best fork point candidate combination determination processing has not been performed among the groups of fork point candidates that were divided, determines whether the processing of all the groups has been completed, if there is a group that has not been processed, reiterates the best fork point candidate combination determination processing for the groups that have not been processed, and, when the .processing of all the groups has been completed, outputs the sum of the fork point candidate combination, which is the result of processing for each group, as the overall result.

Claim 9

A program parallelization method for a multithreading method in which a sequential processing

program is divided into a plurality of threads and a plurality of processors execute the threads in parallel, comprising the steps of: analyzing the control flow and the data flow of a sequential processing program; determining the fork point candidates of the sequential processing program by referring to the results of the analysis of the control flow and the data flow; generating a test combination only consisting of the fork point candidates that can be simultaneously executed in the one-time fork model from the determined fork point candidates; evaluating, with respect to an input data, the parallel execution performance when the sequential processing program has been parallelized by the generated test fork point candidate combination; determining a best fork point candidate combination by taking the parallel execution performance of the evaluated test fork point candidate combination as the reference; inserting a fork command at each fork point candidate in the determined best combination to generate and output a parallelized program.

Claim 10

A program parallelization method for a multithreading method in which a sequential processing program is divided into a plurality of threads and a plurality of processors execute the threads in parallel, comprising: a step in which a control/data flow analysis unit analyzes the control flow and the data flow of a sequential processing program; a step in which a fork point candidate determination unit generates the fork point candidates by referring to the results of the analysis of the control flow and the data flow by the control/data flow analysis unit; a step in which a best fork point candidate combination determination unit predicts the effect of each of all the fork point candidates on the parallel execution performance and ranks the fork point candidates in the order of the effect; a step in which the best fork point candidate combination determination unit generates an initial fork point candidate combination whose parallel execution performance is evaluated first, and which is assumed to be the best fork point candidate combination; a step in which a parallel execution performance evaluation unit generates a sequential execution trace when the sequential processing program was sequentially executed with the input data; a step in which the parallel execution performance evaluation unit divides the sequential execution trace by taking all the terminal point candidates as division points a step in which the parallel execution performance evaluation unit analyzes thread element information for each thread element, and memorizes the thread element information for each thread element. a step in which a best fork point candidate combination determination unit selects one fork point candidate that is ranked highest order among the nonselected fork point candidates; a step in which the best fork point candidate combination determination unit assesses whether the fork point candidate selected is contained in the best fork point candidate combination; a step in which, if the selected fork point candidate is not contained in the best fork point candidate combination, the best fork point candidate combination determination unit adds the selected fork point candidate to the best fork point candidate combination, and sets the fork point candidate combination as a test combination; a step in which, if the selected fork point candidate is contained in the best fork point candidate combination, the best fork point candidate combination determination unit removes the selected fork point candidate from the best fork point candidate combination, and sets the fork point candidate combination as the test combination; a step in which the best fork point candidate combination determination unit evaluates the parallel execution performance of parallelization by the test combination through the parallel execution performance evaluation unit; a step in which the best fork point candidate combination determination unit compares the

Art Unit: 2193

parallel execution performance of the test combination with the parallel execution performance of the best combination; a step in which, if the parallel execution performance of the test combination is better, the best fork point candidate combination determination unit sets the test combination as the best fork point candidate combination at the current time; a step in which the best fork point candidate combination determination unit assesses whether a fork point candidate that has not been selected exists, and if a fork point candidate that has not been selected exists, reiterates execution; a step in which, if a non-selected fork point candidate does not exist, the best fork point candidate combination determination unit assesses whether a new best fork point candidate combination is found in the previous iterative execution; a step in which, if a new best fork point candidate combination is found, the best fork point candidate combination determination unit sets all the fork point candidates to the non-selected state for the iterative execution; a step in which, if a new best fork point candidate combination is not found, the best fork point candidate combination determination unit outputs the determined best fork point candidate combination as the result of the best fork point candidate combination determination processing; and a step in which a parallelized program output unit generates and outputs the parallelized program by inserting a fork command at each fork point candidate of the best combination determined by the best fork point candidate combination determination unit.

Claim 11

A program parallelization method for a multithreading method in which a sequential processing program is divided into a plurality of threads and a plurality of processors execute the threads in parallel, comprising: a step in which a control/data flow analysis unit analyzes the control flow and the data flow of a sequential processing program; a step in which a fork point candidate determination unit generates the fork point candidates by referring to the results of the analysis of the control flow and the data flow by the control/data flow analysis unit; a step in which a best fork point candidate combination determination unit predicts the effect of each of all the fork point candidates on the parallel execution performance and ranks the fork point candidates in the order of the effect; a step in which the best fork point candidate combination determination unit generates an initial fork point candidate combination whose parallel execution performance is evaluated first, and which is assumed to be the best fork point candidate combination; a step in which a parallel execution performance evaluation unit generates a sequential execution trace when the sequential processing program was sequentially executed with the input data; a step in which the parallel execution performance evaluation unit divides the sequential execution trace by taking all the terminal point candidates as division points; a step in which the parallel execution performance evaluation unit analyzes thread element information for each thread element, and memorizes the thread element information for each thread element; a step in which a best fork point candidate combination determination unit selects one fork point candidate that is ranked highest order among the nonselected fork point candidates; a step in which the best fork point candidate combination determination unit assesses whether the selected fork point candidate is contained in the best fork point candidate combination; a step in which, if the selected fork point candidate is not contained in the best fork point candidate combination, the best fork point candidate combination determination unit adds the selected fork point candidate to the best fork point candidate combination, and sets the fork point candidate combination as a test combination; a step in which the best fork point candidate combination determination unit

Art Unit: 2193

removes the fork point candidate that cancels the selected fork point candidate from the test combination; a step in which, if the selected fork point candidate is contained in the best fork point candidate combination, the best fork point candidate combination determination unit removes the selected fork point candidate from the best fork point candidate combination, and sets the fork point candidate combination as the test combination; a step in which the best fork point candidate combination determination unit evaluates the parallel execution performance of parallelization by the test combination through the parallel execution performance evaluation unit; a step in which the best fork point candidate combination determination unit compares the parallel execution performance of the test combination with the parallel execution performance of the best combination; a step in which, if the parallel execution performance of the test combination is better, the best fork point candidate combination determination unit removes the fork point candidate that is canceled by the selected fork point candidate from the test combination; a step in which the best fork point candidate combination determination unit sets the test combination as the best fork point candidate combination at the current time; a step in which the best fork point candidate combination determination unit assesses whether a fork point candidate that has not been selected exists, and if a fork point candidate that has not been selected exists, reiterates execution; a step in which, if a non-selected fork point candidate does not exist, the best fork point candidate combination determination unit assesses whether a new best fork point candidate combination is found in the previous iterative execution; a step in which, if a new best fork point candidate combination is found, the best fork point candidate combination determination unit sets all the fork point candidates to the non-selected state for the iterative execution; a step in which, if a new best fork point candidate combination is not found, the best fork point candidate combination determination unit outputs the determined best fork point candidate combination to the parallelized program output unit as the result of the best fork point candidate combination determination processing; and a step in which the parallelized program output unit generates and outputs the parallelized program by inserting a fork command at each fork point candidate of the best combination determined by the best fork point candidate combination determination unit.

Claim 16

A program parallelization program that is executed on a computer causing, a computer to operate as a control/data flow analysis function which analyzes the control flow and the data flow of a sequential processing program; a fork point candidate determination function which determines the fork point candidates of the sequential processing program by referring to the results of the analysis of the control flow and the data flow by said control/data flow analysis function; a parallel execution performance evaluation function which evaluates, with respect to an input data, a parallel execution performance when the sequential processing program has been parallelized by a test combination of fork point candidates that were given; a best fork point candidate combination determination function which generates a test combination of the fork point candidates that were determined by said fork point candidate determination function, provides the test combination to said parallel execution performance evaluation function, and by taking the parallel execution performance of the test fork point candidate combination evaluated thereby as the reference determines the best fork point candidate combination; and a parallelized program output function which generates and outputs a parallelized program by inserting a fork

Art Unit: 2193

command at each fork point candidate of the best combination determined by said best fork point candidate combination determination function.

Claim 18

The program parallelization program as set forth in claim 16, wherein said parallel execution performance evaluation function generates a sequential execution trace when the sequential processing program was sequentially executed with the input data, divides the sequential execution trace by taking all the terminal point candidates as division points, analyzes thread element information for each thread element, and simulates parallel execution by units of thread element with respect to the test combination of the fork point candidates that were given to calculate the parallel execution performance.

Claim 19

The program parallelization program as set forth in claim 16, wherein said best fork point candidate combination determination function constructs a better combination by ranking the fork point candidates determined by said fork candidate determination function in the order in which the fork point candidates are predicted to have an influence on parallel execution performance, and evaluating the parallel execution performance according to the order by taking the best fork point candidate combination at that time as the reference.

Claim 20

The program parallelization program as set forth in claim 19, wherein said best fork point candidate combination determination function assuming that the combination of the fork point candidates including the prescribed numbers from the top in the order of the fork point candidates determined is an initial combination, evaluates the parallel execution performance of the initial combination with said parallel execution performance evaluation function, and sets the initial combination to the best fork point candidate combination at this time.

Claim 21

The program parallelization program as set forth in claim 15, wherein said best fork point candidate combination determination function divides the collection of all the fork point candidates that have been determined by said fork point candidate determination function into fork point candidate groups in such a way that the fork point candidates have as little effects as possible on each other, generates a test fork point candidate combination for a group in the divided fork point candidate groups in which the best fork point candidate combination determination processing has not been performed, performs the best fork point candidate combination determination processing that determines the best fork point candidate combination by referring to the result of parallel execution performance of the test fork point candidate combination evaluated by said parallel execution performance evaluation function, and determines the sum of the best fork point candidate combinations, which are the processing results for each group, as the overall processing result.

Claim 22

Art Unit: 2193

The program parallelization program as set forth in claim 21, wherein said best fork point candidate combination determination function calls the fork point candidate group partition processing taking the collection of all the fork point candidates determined by said fork point candidate determination function as a collection after the processing of said fork point candidate determination function has been completed, when the fork point candidate group partition processing is called, starts the group partition processing of the collection if the number of fork point candidates belonging to the given fork point candidate collection is higher than the designated division number lower limit, returns to the origin from where the fork point candidate group partition processing was called without performing the group partition processing if the number of the fork point candidates is lower, divides from the collection the fork point candidate collections in which the number of fork point candidates that cancel themselves is higher than the designated number to generate a new group, further divides the collection into two groups, recursively calls the fork point candidate group partition processing taking one group as a collection and performs group partitioning of the group, recursively calls the fork point candidate group partitioning process taking the other group as a collection and performs group partitioning of the group, returns to the origin from where the fork point candidate group partitioning process was called, performs the best fork point candidate combination determination processing for the groups in which the best fork point candidate combination determination processing has not been performed among the groups of fork point candidates that were divided, determines whether the processing of all the groups has been completed, if there is a group that has not been processed, reiterates the best fork point candidate combination determination processing for the groups that have not been processed, and, when the processing of all the groups has been completed, outputs the sum of the fork point candidate combination, which is the result of processing for each group, as the overall result.

Claim 17

A program parallelization program that is executed on a computer causing, a computer to operate as a control/data flow analysis function which analyzes the control flow and the data flow of a sequential processing program; a fork point candidate determination function which determines the fork point candidates of the sequential processing program by referring to the results of the analysis of the control flow and the data flow by said control/data flow analysis function; a parallel execution performance evaluation function which evaluates, with respect to an input data, a parallel execution performance when the sequential processing program has been parallelized by a test combination of fork point candidates that were given; a best fork point candidate combination determination function which generates a test combination only consisting of the combination of fork point candidates that can be simultaneously executed in the one-time fork model from the fork point candidates determined by said fork point candidate determination function, provides the test combination to said parallel execution performance evaluation function, and by taking the parallel execution performance of the test fork point candidate combination evaluated thereby as the reference, determines the best fork point candidate combination; a parallelized program output function which generates and outputs a parallelized program by inserting a fork command at each fork point candidate of the best combination determined by said best fork point candidate combination determination function.

Correspondence Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Todd Ingberg whose telephone number is (571) 272-3723. The examiner can normally be reached on during the work week..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on (571) 272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Todd Ingberg/
Primary Examiner

TI